

CLASSICAL GREEK QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by Robert Renehan

Georgio Florovsky
S. P. D.

*ego, quod rogatus eram ut munusculum in ἑρσεν ad te, vir clarissime, obferendum conferrem, — magis mihi videbar honorem accipere quam tribuere. attamen, quoniam rem, quam tractare mihi in animo erat, tibi cordi esse pro certo habebam, confirmatus sum ne propositum deponerem. sum igitur scrutaturus aliquatenus, quantulumcunque id est, qua ratione scriptores Graeci et Christiani inter sese cohaereant, id quod non dubito quin magnopere probes. namque et ego et tu (si parva licet componere magnis) paricum gaudio studioque luculenta illa verba Wilamowitzii semper audimus: "... quo effectum est, ut Iudaica et Christiana multo magis distare videantur a Graecis, quam re vera distabant aut distare poterant. nam populus idem erat, eisdem moribus, eadem vita, eodem melioris vitae, puriorum morum desiderio, eadem denique superstitione. quapropter neque sine Graecis Christianae neque sine Christianis Graecae litterae recte aut intellegi aut aestimari possunt. hoc mementote commilitones." **

In this paper I shall attempt to answer two questions. First, how many actual quotations from Greek literature have been identified in the New Testament? (As will appear presently, there is no little confusion on this question, a confusion which is still widely disseminated in current editions and translations of the New Testament.) Secondly, are there likely to be any hitherto

* Since these remarks of Wilamowitz occur in one of his lesser known writings, some may find it useful to have the reference in full: *Index Scholarum publice et privatim in Academia Georgia Augusta per oemstra aestivum a. d. XV. m. Aprilis usque ad d. XV m. Augusti. a. MDCCC. LXXXIII habendarum. Praemissa est Udalrici de Wilamowitz-Moellendorf De Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmentis Commentatio* (Gottingae 1893), p. 33.

unrecognized classical quotations in the New Testament? Before proceeding to these two questions proper, it is necessary to establish clearly the distinction between a) actual quotations and b) other literary inheritances taken over from the Hellenic παράδοσις by New Testament writers. (The following illustrations are offered as specimen examples only and are not intended to be exhaustive.)

First of all, we ought to distinguish between general allusions of a proverbial nature and specific quotations. Take, for instance, I *Timothy* 6.10: ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία. The evidence is fairly clear that this kind of statement is a proverbial commonplace which had long been current in the classical world: 1) *Dinarchus oratio* 1.22 ἀρ' ὑμῖν δοκεῖ μικρῶν κακῶν ἢ τῶν τυχόντων ὅλη τῇ Ἑλλάδι αἰτίος γεγενῆσθαι Δημοσθένους καὶ ἡ τούτου φιλαργυρία; 2) *Aristotle frag.* 544 *Rosae* α' φιλοχρηματία Σπάρταν ὀλεῖ, ἄλλο δὲ οὐδέν (compare *Diodorus Siculus* 7.12.5); 3) "Hippocrates" *Epistle* 17.43 τούτων ἀπάντων αἰτία ἡ φιλαργυρία; 4) *Galen* 1.61 Κῆλην πάντα γὰρ α' τόλμῳ ἀδίκως ἄνθρωποι, φιλοχρηματίας ἀναπειθοῦσης ἢ γοητευούσης ἡδονῆς πράττουσιν; 5) *Galen* 5.53 Κῆλην αἰσχρὸν γὰρ ... αἰσχροῖς καὶ ἀσελγέσι καὶ τυραννικαῖς δεισποίναις δουλεύειν, φιλοχρηματίας τε καὶ μικρολογίας καὶ φιλαρχίας καὶ φιλοδοξίας καὶ φιλοτιμίας. καίτοι τούτων ἀπασῶν οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμι φάναι μητέρα πλεονεξίας. Latin authors, presumably imitating Greek sources, express comparable sentiments: 1) *Cato ap. Aulus Gellius* 11.2.2 (= *frag.* 1 *Jordan*) *avaritiam omnia vitia habere putabant*; 2) *Sallust Catilina* 10.3 *igitur primo pecuniae, deinde imperi cupido crevit: ex quasi materies omnium malorum fuisse*; 3) *Horace Odes* 3.24.48-52 ... *gemmas et lapides aurum in inutile, / summi materiem mali / ... eradenda cupidinis / pravi sunt elementa*. Pseudo-Phocylides, verso 42 (= *Oracula Sibyllina* 2.111) is a very close parallel: ἡ φιλοχρημοσύνη μήτηρ κακότητος ἀπάσης. This is especially significant evidence, since the unknown author of the *Pseudo-Phocylidea* seems to have been a Hellenized Jew living in the first century before Christ¹ and thus represents a bridge (perhaps symbolic only) between pagan Greek literature and *First Timothy*. It thus appears that the famous biblical saying, "The love of money is the root of all evil," is in fact a familiar Greek τόπος. In addition to the passages already cited, compare also *Diogenes the Cynic ap. Diogenes Laertius* 6.50: τὴν φιλαργυρίαν εἶπε μητρόπολιν πάντων τῶν κακῶν.² (φιλαργυρία, φιλάργυρος, φιλαργυρεῖν and their

¹ See R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York 1949), pp. 225-6.

² For some other examples, see Arndt-Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* s. v. φιλαργυρία.

synonyms φιλοχρηματία, φιλοχρήματος, φιλοχρηματεῖν are all common words in Greek.) It does not even seem that the specific image, in this context, of "root" (ρίζα) can be safely ascribed, as his own creation, to the author of *First Timothy*. This is suggested by a passage in Sophocles' *Antigone* (vv. 295 ff.):

οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώποισιν οἶον ἄργυρος | κακὸν νόμισμ' ἐβλαστε.
τοῦτο καὶ πόλεις | πορθεῖ, τόδ' ἀνδρας ἐξανίστησιν δόμων · | τὸδ'
ἐκδιδάσκει κτλ.

The implications of the verb ἐβλαστε for the existence of such an image are plain; indeed, the very phrase ρίζα κακῶν (with a form of the verb βλαστάνω in the same verse!) is found as early as Euripides, *frag.* 912. 11 Nauck.

In this case the evidence was sufficiently abundant to exclude the possibility of coincidence. Often certainty on this score is not attainable, since the same or similar proverbial and gnomie utterances can occur independently in different authors or languages. Take *Matthew* 7.3: τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν οὐ κατανοεῖς; (Compare *Luke* 6.41.) Very close to this is *Comicorum Atticorum Frag. Adesp.* 359 Kock: τί τέλλοτριν, ἀνθρώπε βασκανώτατε, / κακὸν ὀξυδορκεῖς, τὸ δ' ἴδιον παραβλέπεις; (See also *Horace Sermones* 1.3.25-27, 73-74.) Is this coincidence or is there ultimately a common source? It seems to me impossible to say. A similar instance is *Luke* 4.23: ἰατρὲ, θεράπευσον σεαυτὸν. Compare *Aeschylus, Prometheus* vv. 473-475:

κακὸς δ' ἰατρὸς ὥς τις ἐς νόσον
πασὼν ἀθυμεῖς καὶ σεαυτὸν οὐκ ἔχεις
εὑρεῖν ὅποιοις φαρμάκοις λάσιμος.

and Euripides *frag.* 1086 Nauck ἄλλων ἰατρὸς αὐτὸς εἰκασιν βρύων; more explicit is *Servius Sulpicius Rufus* in a letter to *Cicero* (*ad Fam.* 4.5.5): *noli ... imitari malos medicos qui in alienis morbis proficentur tenere se medicinae scientiam, ipsi = curare non possunt.* *Babrius Fable* 120.6-7 is also quite similar:

« καὶ πῶς », ἀλώπηξ εἶπεν, « ἄλλον ἰήσῃ,
δὲ σεαυτὸν οὕτω χλωρὸν ὄντα μὴ σφάζεις; »

(With *Babrius* σφάζεις compare *Mark* 15.31: ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι.) Here again, since the doctor who presumes to treat others, yet cannot treat himself is a natural enough 'type',

which could easily suggest itself to many, coincidence cannot be excluded — but, be it remembered, neither can the possibility that the New Testament writer does in fact derive from the same tradition as the 'pagan' authors.

By way of contrast, there are passages where coincidence can be clearly demonstrated. *Mark* 8.18: ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; *Matthew* 13.13: βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν. See also *Mark* 4.12; *John* 12.40; *Acts*. 28.26. Various classical "parallels" can be cited:

- μαινόμενε, φρένας ἤλέ, διέφθορας· ἧ νύ τοι αὖτως οὐατ' ἀκούεμεν ἐστί, νόος δ' ἀπόλωλε καὶ αἰδώς.
(*Iliad*. 15. 128-129)
- οἱ πρῶτα μὲν βλέποντες ἔβλεπον μάτην,
κλύοντες οὐκ ἤκουον ...
(Aeschylus *Prometheus* 447-448)
- οὐχ ὄρῃς ὄρῶν τάδε;
(Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1623)
- σὺ καὶ δέδορκας κοῦ βλέπεις ἐν' εἰ κακοῦ
(Sophocles *Oedipus Tyrannus* 413)
- ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς πράσσοντες οὐ κωφοὶ μόνον,
ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὄρῶντες εἰσορῶσι τάμφανῃ.
(Sophocles *frag.* 837 Nauck = *frag.* 923 Pearson)
- ... ὥστε, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, ὄρῶντας μὴ ὄρᾶν καὶ ἀκούοντας μὴ ἀκούειν ...
([Demosthenes] *oratio* 25.89)
- ἀξύνετοι ἀκούσαντες κωφοῖσιν ἐοίκασιν· φάτις αὐτοῖσιν μαρτυρεῖ παρόντας ἀπεῖναι.
(Heraclitus *frag.* 34 Diels-Kranz)

Eduard Fraenkel in his magnificent commentary to the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus correctly observes at verse 1623 that "Very likely the tragedians are alluding to a proverb." He rightly states that "the expression [i. e. in verse 1623] belongs to a widespread popular 'thought-pattern', as has long been recognized," and then cites all the classical passages given above (except the Heraclitus fragment — which, curiously, Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14 p. 718, compares to the biblical ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκούετω) and further compares (following Peile) *Mark* 8.18 and *Matthew* 13.13. In this case the references given by some classical scholars are misleading. There can be no question of an immediate (or even

intermediate) dependence of the New Testament writers on Greek literature here, for the very good reason that the passages in the New Testament are directly inspired by the Old Testament, especially *Isaiah* 6.9-10 (Fraenkel, for example, seems unaware of this): ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτε· ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἴσωμαι αὐτούς. See also *Jeremiah* 5.21 and *Ezekiel* 12.2. In order to illustrate the danger of being too quick to see parallels to the New Testament in classical Greek literature I cite here a passage from the *Funeral Oration* (= *Epitaphios* 27-28) of the Attic orator Hyperides: ... ἀδελφοὶ γάμων τῶν προσηκόντων ἐνόμως τετυχήκασι καὶ τεύχονται, παῖδες ἐφόδιον εἰς τὴν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίαν τὴν τῶν οὐκ ἀπολωλότων ἀρετῇ, οὐ γὰρ θεμιτὸν τούτου τοῦ δνόματος τυχεῖν τοὺς οὕτως ὑπὲρ καλῶν τὸν βίον ἐκλιπόντας, ἀλλὰ τῶν τὸ ζῆν εἰς αἰώνιον τάξιν μετελλαχόντων ἔξουσιν. εἰ γὰρ ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὢν ἀνιάρωτος θάνατος τούτοις ἀρχηγὸς μεγάλων ἀγαθῶν γέγονε, πῶς τούτους οὐκ εὐτυχεῖς κρίνειν δίκαιον, ἢ πῶς ἐκλειοιπέται τὸν βίον, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγονέναι καλλίῳ γένεσιν τῆς πρώτης ὑπαρξιάς; τότε μὲν γὰρ παῖδες ὄντες ἄφρονες ἦσαν, νῦν δ' ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γεγονάσιν. On a first reading, the "Christian" tone of this passage is striking; one could adduce the frequent references to ζωὴ αἰώνιος in the New Testament, the allusions therein to spiritual παλιγγενεσία and so forth. The final sentence cannot but remind one of *First Corinthians* 13.11 (ὅτε ἤμην νήπιος, ἐλάλουν ὡς νήπιος, ἐφρόνουν ὡς νήπιος, ἐλογιζόμην ὡς νήπιος· ὅτε γέγονα ἀνὴρ, κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ νηπίου). The allusion to death as being most painful to others, but the ἀρχηγός of great good to these men might put one in mind of *First Corinthians* 15.55 ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον; (compare *Hosea* 13.14). All this is, of course, illusory; anyone at all familiar with Greek modes of religious belief will recognize at once that these "parallels" are apparent only. There is not the slightest probability that anything in the New Testament has been influenced by these words of Hyperides.

We need not always be so skeptical. There are indeed New Testament passages which, while still not exact quotations from classical Greek literature, have every probability of going back, directly or indirectly, to specific classical writings. Some of these must now be examined. W. Nestle, in his paper "Anklänge an Euripides in der Apostelgeschichte" (*Philologus* 59.1900.46-57), argues cogently that the author of *Acts* was familiar with Eurip-

ides' tragedy, the *Bacchae*, and imitated it in several places. He offers *inter alia* the following pieces of evidence, which are carefully documented. The uncommon word θεομάχος which occurs at *Acts* 5.39 (μήποτε καὶ θεομάχοι εὗρεθῆτε) may go back to Euripides, who uses the verb θεομαχεῖν three times in the *Bacchae* (verses 45, 325, 1255) and also in the *Iphigenia Aulidensis* (verse 1408 — if this verse is genuine). Nestle believes that the "Wortgruppe" θεομάχος / θεομαχεῖν is actually Euripides' own creation. E. R. Dodds, the most recent commentator on the *Bacchae*, notes at verse 45 "The author of *Acts* may have had echoes of the *Bacchae* in his head when he wrote εἰ δὲ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστίν, οὐ δυνήσεσθε καταλῦσαι αὐτούς: μήποτε καὶ θεομάχοι εὗρεθῆτε (5.39): he had probably read the play..." Secondly, some of the details of Peter's deliverance from prison in *Acts* seem modelled on the liberation of the women in *Bacchae* 443-448. Dodds there comments "Memories of the present passage may have helped to shape the story of the miraculous freeing of Peter in *Acts* 12: with 447-8 [αὐτόματα δ' αὐταῖς δεσμὰ διελύθη ποδῶν / κληῖδες τ' ἀνῆκαν θύρετρ' ἄνευ θνητῆς χειρός] cf. *Acts* 12.7 ἐξέπεσον αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν, and 10 (ἡ πύλη) αὐτομάτῃ ἠνοιχθῆ αὐταῖς, also 16.26." Thirdly, Nestle calls attention to *Acts* 26.14: Σαούλ Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν (compare *Acts* 9.5 *Textus Receptus*). He notes that this is "die einzige Stelle im ganzen Neuen Testament, wo das Wort λακτίζειν vorkommt, das sich auch bei den LXX nie findet, während es in der griechischen Profanliteratur sehr häufig ist. Πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν ist ein griechisches Sprichwort..."³ In Greek literature this proverb survives in Pindar *Pythian* 2.94-95; *frag. iamb. adesp.* 13 Diehl; Aeschylus *Prometheus* 323, *Agamemnon* 1624⁴; Euripides *frag.* 604 Nauck and *Bacchae* 795 (θόοιμ' ἂν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον ἢ θυμούμενος / πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζοιμ' ὀνητὸς ὢν θεῷ)⁵. I quote

³ Nestle *loc. cit.*, p. 51.

⁴ I call attention to the curious fact that in two successive lines of the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus there are apparent parallels to the New Testament: οὐχ ὁρᾷς ὁρῶν τάδε; (verse 1623) / πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λακτίζε (verse 1624). The former of these, as we have seen, is coincidence; the latter is not the direct source of *Acts* 26.14, but does in fact share a common ancestor with *Acts*.

⁵ The proverb may originally derive from an animal fable. A comparison of the context in which it occurs in Pindar with *frag. iamb. adesp.* 13 Diehl tends to favor this. So R. W. B. Burton in *Pindar's Pythian Odes* (Oxford 1962), p. 133: "A celebrated phrase to express revolt occurs perhaps for the first time in literature in [*Pythian* 2] vv. 94 f., though there is a fragment assigned tentatively by Crusius to Solon [= *frag. iamb. adesp.* 13 Diehl]:

Dodds again on *Bacchae* 795: "The author of *Acts* uses [the proverb πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν] (9.5 and 26.14) exactly as Eur. does, as a warning to the θεομάχος: he may in fact have borrowed it from the present passage..."⁶ There is perhaps another echo of Euripides in *Acts* 19.35: ... ἄνδρες Ἐφεσίοι, τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων ὃς οὐ γινώσκει τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν νεωκόρον οὖσαν τῆς μεγάλης Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τοῦ διοπετοῦς; The exact meaning of τὸ διοπετές in this verse is a familiar controversy⁷; *LSJ* state that ἀγαλμα is to be understood with it. In view of his apparent familiarity with Euripides, it seems perfectly possible that the author of *Acts* has borrowed his phrase directly from the *Iphigenia in Tauris*, verses 977-978:

Φοῖβός μ' ἐπεμψε δεῦρο, διοπετές λαβεῖν
ἀγαλμ' Ἀθηνῶν τ' ἐγκαθιδρῦσαι χθονί.

Several Pauline passages reveal clear echoes of Plato's *Apology*:

εἰ τις δοκεῖ ἐγκωκέναι τι, οὕτω ἐγὼ καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι.
(*First Corinthians* 8.2)

εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναι τι μηδὲν ὄν, φρεναπατᾷ ἑαυτόν.
(*Galatians* 6.3)

With these compare the following:

οὗτος μὲν οἶεται τι εἰδέναι οὐκ εἰδώς, ἐγὼ δέ, ὥσπερ οὖν
οὐκ οἶδα, οὐδὲ οἶομαι.
(*Apology* 21 D)

— ἐὰν δοκῶσί τι εἶναι μηδὲν ὄντες ... οἶονται τι εἶναι ὄντες
οὐδενὸς ἄξιοι ...
(*Apology* 41 E)

⁶ ἵππος ὄνῳ· πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λακτιζέτω.
'said the horse to the ass: let him not kick against the pricks.' The form of this line suggests that the proverb came originally from a remark in a beast-fable, like so much else in this triad (my italics)."

⁷ For a detailed study of the relation of *Acts* to Euripides' *Bacchae* see O. Weinreich 'Gebet und Wunder' in *Tübinger Beiträge z. Alt. V* (= *Genethliakon W. Schmid*), pp. 309-341. Weinreich concludes: "Wie man also die Dinge dreht und wendet, es bleibt bei dem vorgeschlagenen Lösungsversuch: der Verfasser der Apg. hat die Bakchen unmittelbar benutzt."

⁸ See E. Svenberg in *Eranos* 46. 1948. 129-132.

What is the relation of these passages to one another? Plato's *Apology* had an early and constant fame, and there is no reason why Paul could not have read it, in school or out. On the other hand, these Socratic antitheses acquired an independent existence of their own and doubtless formed part of the intellectual inheritance of many who had never read the *Apology*. Despite this uncertainty, it seems to me that we can safely trace Paul's inspiration here, one way or another, ultimately back to Plato.

Euripides also can be shown to have contributed, ultimately, to Paul's thought. Thanks to the analyses of various scholars — most recently Bruno Snell in his Sather Lectures of 1963, "Scenes from Greek Drama"⁸ — we have gained a clearer understanding of the significance of several Euripidean passages which seem to be the intellectual archetype for a famous section in Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*, c. 7.15 ff.: ὁ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω · οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ ... οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ ὁ οὐ θέλω κακόν τοῦτο πράσσω ... The crucial passage is *Medea* 1077-1080 (Medea is speaking prior to proceeding to the murder of her own children);

... ἀλλὰ νικῶμαι κακοῖς.
καὶ μανθάνω μὲν οἷα δεῖν μέλλω κακά,
θυμὸς δὲ κρείσσων τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων,
ὅσπερ μεγίστων αἴτιος κακῶν βροτοῖς.

Of these verses Snell comments "The conflict, therefore, is a battle inside the heart of man. Passion, θυμός, is stronger than the reasonable intentions (βουλεύματα). That is nothing new for us; but here it is making its first appearance (my italics)."⁹ And again "This image of the inner battle to which Euripides' Medea gives full meaning for the first time by connecting it with a moral conflict ... is subsequently the model by which one orientates oneself when engaged in moral reflection. 'Selfcommand,' 'victory over self' — these are categories which have been handed down to us, chiefly by way of Socrates and of the Stoa."¹⁰ Other relevant passages which Snell cites and discusses are the following:

⁸ Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964. (This book is of course a continuation of some of Snell's earlier work; compare n. 11 *infra*).

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 54.

τὰ χρήστ' ἐπιστάμεσθα καὶ γινώσκουμεν,
οὐκ ἐκπονοῦμεν δ', οἳ μὲν ἀργίας ὑπο,
οἳ δ' ἡδονὴν προθέντες ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ
ἄλλην τιν' .

(Euripides *Hippolytus* vv. 380-383)

πολλοὶ δὲ θνητῶν τοῦτο πάσχουσιν κακόν .
γνώμη φρονούντες οὐ θέλουσ' ὑπηρετεῖν
ψυχῇ τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς φίλων νικώμενοι

(Euripides *frag.* 220 Nauck²)

αἰαῖ, τόδ' ἤδη θεῖον ἀνθρώποις κακόν,
ὅταν τις εἰδῇ τάγαθόν, χρῆται δὲ μή.

(Euripides *frag.* 841 Nauck²)

οἶσθα οὖν ὅτι οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐμοί
τε καὶ σοὶ οὐ πείθονται, ἀλλὰ πολλοὺς φασὶ
γινώσκοντας τὰ βέλτιστα οὐκ ἐθέλειν
πράττειν, ἐξὸν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ ἄλλα πράττειν.

(Plato *Protagoras* 352 d)¹¹

προσερωτώμενος δὲ εἰ τοὺς ἐπισταμένους μὲν

■ δεῖ πράττειν, ποιούντας δὲ τάναντία,
σοφοὺς τε καὶ ἀκρατεῖς εἶναι νομίζοι κτλ.

(Xenophon *Memorabilia* 3.9.4)

Although Snell does not quote it, perhaps the most familiar expression, in our Western cultural tradition, of this moral conflict is to be found in the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, VII. 18-21 (Medea is the speaker) :

*si possem, sanior essem ;
sed trahit invitam nova vis, aliudque cupido,
mens aliud suadet. video meliora proboque,
deteriora sequor.*

Less well-known is Horace's ... *quae nocuere sequar, fugiam quae profore credam* (*Epist.* 1.8.11). (A 'variation' of this same theme, though no one appears to have remarked it, is to be seen in a fragment of Menander, 489 Koerte : εὐηθία μοι φαίνεται, Φιλουμένη, / τὸ νοεῖν μὲν ὅσα δεῖ, μὴ φυλάττεσθαι δ' ἃ δεῖ. I need not remind the reader how much Menander owes to Euripides.)

¹¹ It is Snell's thesis that Euripides engaged in a dispute with the historical Socrates, a dispute which he sees reflected in the Euripidean verses quoted here. See W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. III (Cambridge 1969), pp. 258-259 (with the notes).

It is not my intention to deny for an instant Saint Paul's profound originality as a theologian. Nevertheless, the fact remains that in this passage of *Romans* we can still detect, clothed in a new dress, traces of a motif which, so far as is now known, first appeared in Athens in the fifth century before Christ. This does not mean that Paul necessarily had read Euripides; by his day this problem had become a τόπος. In discussing the verses from the *Medea* cited above, Snell remarks "Later (p. 63 f.) we shall meet several other lines of Euripides which contain similar reflections. They were evidently systematically collected by the Stoic Chrysippus and later found their way into various anthologies and treatises (my italics). The lines from *Medea* are the earliest among them; this is also proof that Euripides had evidently not had such thoughts before *Medea*."¹²

Thus far we have been dealing with verbal echoes and thought recurrences. Another type of classical influence is that in which there is a purely formal structural correspondence. The most striking example of this has always seemed to me to be the formal parallelism between the early elegiac poet Tyrtæus, frag. 9.1-11 and Paul's famous praise of ἀγάπη in *First Corinthians* 13.1-3, a parallelism to which Werner Jaeger called attention in 1932.¹³ As Jaeger's paper is still not widely known to New Testament scholars, it may serve some purpose to reproduce the two passages here:

οὐτ' ἂν μνησαίμην οὐτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθεῖν
 οὐτε ποδῶν ἀρετῆς οὐτε παλαιμασύνης,
 οὐδ' εἰ Κυκλώπων μὲν ἔχει μέγεθος τε βίην τε,
 νικῶν ■ θέων Θρηίκιον Βορέην,
 οὐδ' εἰ Τιδωνοῖο φύην χαριέστερος εἶη, 5
 πλουτοῖη δὲ Μίδεω καὶ Κυνύρῳ μάλιον,
 οὐδ' εἰ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἶη,
 γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μελιχόγηρυν ἔχει,
 οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχει δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ὤκειας.
 οὐ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἀγαθὸς γίγνεται ἐν πολέμῳ, 10
 εἰ μὴ τετρατῆ μὲν ὄρῳ φόνον αἱματόεντα
 καὶ δῆλῳν ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ἰστάμενος.
 (Tyrtæus)

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 51, n. 4.

¹³ "Tyrtæos Ueber Die Wahre APETH", *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. der Wissensch. Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 22, 1932, 567-568 = W. Jaeger, *Scripta Minora* (Rome 1960) II, 112-114 = W. Jaeger, *Five Essays* (Montreal 1966) 141-142.

ἐάν τις γλώσσας τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀγάπην
δὲ μὴ ἔχω, γέγονα χαλκὸς ἢ ἥων ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον.
καὶ ἐάν ἔχω προφητείαν καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν
τὴν γνῶσιν,
κἂν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὅρη μεθιστάναι, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ
ἔχω, οὐθέν εἰμι.
κἂν ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου κἂν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου,
ἵνα καυχῇσμαι, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι.
(St. Paul)

Here are some of Jaeger's observations:¹⁴ "I should think it unlikely that anyone, in reading these magnificent lines, has ever thought of Tyrtaeus, so great is the distance that lies between his world and that of Paul. And yet ... the extraordinary similarity of form is striking ... Not only are individual words here similar, for example: κἂν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ... ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω compare this with οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ἐλκῆς, but there is the same sustained crescendo of the repeated 'even if,' and the same emphatic negation: οὐτ' ἂν μνησαίμην οὐτ' ἐν λόγῳ ἄνδρα τιθεῖν; compare οὐθέν εἰμι, οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι ... While the Greek poets copied each other knowingly, it is best to assume that Paul produces a spontaneous rebirth of thought, which would explain the formal analogies. It is of course not improbable that Paul knew the Greek Anthology from school, where, in Paul's days as much as in classical times, the poets continued to be read. Another possibility is that the basic elements of the Greek prototype had, in a general way, entered into the popular philosophy of the Hellenistic age, and its sermons περὶ ἀρετῆς. From these Paul may have taken his model ... In any case it is significant that the rule of the noblest of the new values which Christianity added to the store of ancient wisdom was formulated in a fashion thoroughly congenial to the Greek way of thinking."

It is, I believe, possible to provide a close structural parallel from the immediate context and thereby provide further plausibility to Jaeger's thesis. In the preceding chapter of *I Corinthians*, verses 4-11 run as follows:

Διακρίσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσιν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα·
καὶ διακρίσεις διακονιῶν εἰσιν, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος· καὶ δια-
κρίσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν
τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. ἑκάστῳ δὲ δίδεται ἡ φανέρωσις τοῦ

¹⁴ I quote from the English translation in *Five Essays* (see the preceding note).

πνεύματος πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον. ὃ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος διδεται λόγος σοφίας, ἄλλω δὲ λόγος γνώσεως κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, ἑτέρω πιστις ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι, ἄλλω δὲ χάρισμα ἰαμάτων ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ πνεύματι, ἄλλω ■ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, ἄλλω [δὲ] προφητεία, ἄλλω δὲ διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, ἑτέρω γένη γλωσσῶν, ἄλλω δὲ ἑρμηνεῖα γλωσσῶν· πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διακροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται.

The thought of this passage is concisely summarized by I *Corinthians* 7.7: ... ἕκαστος ἰδίον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως; see also *Romans* 12.5-8. For both the thought and the formal structure of I *Corinthians* 12.4-11 I do not know whether anyone has compared two passages from Homer, but the parallelism is remarkable:

ἀλλ' οὐ πως ἅμα πάντα δυνήσεται αὐτὸς ἐλέσθαι.
 ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ δῶκε θεὸς πολέμη' ἔργα,
 ἄλλω δ' ὀρχηστῶν, ἑτέρω κίθαριν καὶ αἰοιδήν,
 ἄλλω δ' ἐν στήθεσσι τιθεῖ νόον εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
 ἐσθλόν, τοῦ δέ τε πολλοὶ ἐπαυρίσκοντ' ἄνθρωποι,
 καὶ τε πόλεας ἐσάωσε, μέλιστα δὲ καὐτὸς ἀνέγνω.
Iliad 13.729-734

οὕτως οὐ πάντεσσι θεοὶ χαρίεντα διδοῦσιν
 ἀνδράσιν, οὔτε φηὲν οὔτ' ἄρ' φρένας οὔτ' ἀγορητῶν.
 ἄλλος μὲν γὰρ εἶδος ἀκιδνότερος πέλει ἀνὴρ,
 ἀλλὰ θεὸς μορφὴν ἔπεισι στέφει, οἱ δὲ τ' ἐς αὐτὸν
 τερπόμενοι λεύσσουσιν· ὁ δ' ἀσφαλῆως ἀγορεύει
 αἰδοῖ μελιχίῃ, μετὰ δὲ πρέπει ἀγρομένοισιν,
 ἐρχόμενον δ' ἀνὰ ἔστῳ θεὸν ὥς εἰσπρόωσιν.
 ἄλλος δ' αὖ εἶδος μὲν ἀλίγκιος ἀθανάτοισιν,
 ἀλλ' οὐ οἱ χάρις ἀμφιπεριστέφεται ἐπέεσσιν,
 ὥς καὶ σοὶ εἶδος μὲν ἀριπρεπές, οὐδὲ κεν ἄλλως
 οὐδὲ θεὸς τεύξει, νόον δ' ἀποφώλιός ἐστι.
Odyssey 8.167-177

Here too we are no longer in ■ position to say anything definite about the precise relationship between the Greek poet and Paul, but some ultimate connection at least seems very possible. The presence of two such parallels in successive chapters may well point to the use of a *florilegium*. This suspicion of a Hellenic influence on Paul here becomes even stronger when we realize that in the very next verses in I *Corinthians* 12 (12 ff.) Paul makes use of ■ familiar Greek story, that of the body and its members; for this see W. Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*, p. 14.

Having concluded this brief survey of some of the freer categories of classical echoes, imitations, and allusions in the New Testament, I come now to the exact quotations, real and imaginary. Here the amount of widely-held misinformation is frankly astonishing. Let us examine first Saint Paul, I *Corinthians* 15.33 :

... μὴ πλεναῖσθε · « φθείρουσιν ἡθ[η] χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί. »

The words set within quotation marks form an iambic trimeter verse. (χρηστὰ [for χρήσθ'] is probably nothing but an instance of *scriptio plena*, such as was frequent at the time, and not necessarily a metrical solecism.)¹² It would serve no purpose to give precise references to the numerous editions and translations of the New Testament; suffice to say that in current texts it is often stated that this verse comes specifically from the *Thais* of Menander (frag. 187 Koerte = frag. 218 Kock). The facts are as follows. This verse, as one would expect, is alluded to a number of times by Christian writers¹³; no pagan writer quotes it (but see below). Of those Christian writers who cite the verse, Jerome and Photius attribute it to Menander (without mentioning the name of the play in which it occurred); Socrates the church historian ascribes it to Euripides. Other writers who refer to it do not give the name of any poet. Even so good a scholar as Werner Jaeger could write "... [Clement of Alexandria] likewise (*Strom.* I. 14, Stählin II, 37, 23 ff.) points out ... another Greek reminiscence in I *Corinthians* 15.33, taken from the most famous poet of the New Attic Comedy, Menander (*Thais* frag. 218) ..." ¹⁴ Yet Clement, in the passage in question, not only makes no mention of either Menander or the *Thais* — he states explicitly that Paul "λαμβεῖσιν συγχεῖσθαι τραγικῶν"! In fact there is impressive evidence that the words originally occurred in some tragedy, by Euripides more likely than not. In 1906 Grenfell and Hunt published in the *Hibeh Papyri*, I. 7 the following fragment from a papyrus dated by the editors circa B. C. 250-210 :

ἔπειτα χρῆσθαι
δοκοῦσιν εἰδ[έναι]
εἰδὼς ὁδοῦναι' αἱ
φθείρουσιν ἡθ[η] χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί

¹² See, for example, Blass-Debrunner *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*¹²⁻¹³, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago 1961), § 17; also Benedict Einarson in my *Greek Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass. 1969), p. 53.

¹³ For exact references see Nauck's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*¹⁴, Euripides frag. 1024 and Menander, frag. 187 Koerte.

These lines are sufficiently preserved to make it certain that they are iambic trimeters; that the fourth line was identical with Paul's verse and has accordingly been correctly restored is as certain as such things can be.¹² Grenfell and Hunt observe of the papyrus in which these four verses occur: "... a series of extracts such as are not uncommonly found in papyri of the Ptolemaic period ... Among them are (ll. 10-22) a passage of thirteen iambic lines from the *Electra* of Euripides and (ll. 91-4) an extract of four iambic lines, including the well-known verse, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners,' quoted by St. Paul. These are also probably Euripidean ..." ὁδοῦναι in line three of the papyrus fragment seems to have been a word proper to tragic diction.¹³ A. D. Knox, discussing these verses in *The Classical Quarterly* (19, 1925, 164), observed significantly "It will be seen ... that the verses are written by a tragedian, presumably Euripides, who uses οἶδα ὁδοῦναι, the latter word being unknown to Attic comedy (see Headlam on Herodas V. 20)." In the light of the above it would be perverse to deny that φθείρουσιν ἥδη χρήσθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί is a tragic verse.

¹² *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge, Mass. 1961), p. 112, n. 28. That other great Hellenist, Gilbert Murray, could be just as positive: "... [Menander] is constantly quoted by later authors, including of course [my italics] St. Paul: 'Evil communications corrupt good manners'." In a footnote he adds "1 Cor. xv. 33, from Gatz." Murray's words are to be found in *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, Second Series, edited by J. U. Powell and E. A. Barber (Oxford, 1929) p. 9 with f. n. 1; they are repeated in his *Aristophanes* (Oxford 1933), p. 221. Even Wilamowitz, writing of Menander that "... der Dichter so treffende kurze Wendungen gefunden hat, dass sie im Gedächtnis haften und fliegende Worte wurden" (Menander, *Das Schiedsgericht*, p. 151), goes on to cite, ohne weiteres, this adage as a typical example. Best of all, perhaps, is the statement of the Latinist J. Wight Duff in his *Literary History of Rome from the Origins to the Close of the Golden Age*, p. 123, n. 1: he quotes the saying with the comment "It is a fragment of Menander's brilliant [my italics] *Thais*." Reflect that Duff's confident judgement of the *Thais* as "brilliant" — which it probably was — is a pronouncement about a play "von der auffälligerweise so wenig Bruchstücke übrig sind", as Wilamowitz correctly observed (*op. cit.*, p. 142).

¹³ No one to my knowledge has questioned this restoration. The verses are printed most recently by B. Snell in his *Supplementum* to Nauck's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*² as frag. 1024 of Euripides. In the *Index Pontium* to the *Supplementum*, s. v. P. Hiebel I 7, Snell lists this fragment as a *fragmentum adespotum* (compare his remarks in the *Praefatio ad Supplementa*, p. 1).

¹⁴ *LSJ* s. v. ὁδοῦναι cite nine examples, all from tragedy; compare also *LSJ Supplement* s. v. ὁδοῦναι. None of the examples in *LSJ* are from Euripides; ὁδοῦναι in fact is common in Euripides (*Alceste* 796; *Helena* 104, 591; *Ion* 662; frag. 326, 862).

When one adds to this evidence a) the general consideration that papyri prove Euripides to have been the most widely read Greek poet after Homer in antiquity²⁰ and b) the specific testimony of Socrates that Euripides wrote this verse (testimony which, as will appear, is not likely to be a *lapsus memoriae*), then one cannot escape the conclusion that Euripides is quite probably the author of the trimeter.

Curiously enough, it in no way follows from what has been said that Jerome and Photius are in error when they attribute φθείρουσιν · κακαί to Menander. This great comic poet was much influenced by Euripides and is known to have incorporated verbatim quotations from tragedies into his own comedies. Thus, in the *Aspis* of Menander, verses 407, 424-425, 425-426, 432 (Austin) are citations from Euripides; so too in the *Epitrepontes* of Menander, verse 765 (Koerte) ἡ φύσις ἐβούλεθ' ἢ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει = Euripides, *frag.* 920 Nauck. This last example is especially relevant to the present question. The verse was a famous one in antiquity and was often cited. (The comic poet Anaxandrides parodies it, *frag.* 67 (Kock): ἡ πῶλις ἐβούλεθ', ἢ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει.) Aelian, *De Natura Animalium* 4.54, names Euripides as the author. A scholiast to Gregory of Nazianzus (ed. Piccol. *Estratti ined. dai cod. gr. della bibl. Mediceo-Laur.* p. 21) wrote: ἔς, φύσεως, οὐδὲν βιαίτερον. καὶ παρὰ τῇ νέᾳ κωμῳδίᾳ "ἡ φύσις ἐβούλετο, ἢ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει." This comment of the scholiast, we now know, refers to Menander, *Epitrepontes* verse 765; Nauck, writing before considerable portions of this play of Menander's had been recovered on papyri, printed at Euripides *frag.* 920 the scholiast's remark with the observation "de auctore versus errat Schol...". The verse occurred in both Euripides and Menander, and so it appears that Nauck, not the scholiast, erred. It is quite possible — and indeed probable — that φθείρουσιν ἤδη χρεῖσθ' ὁμῶς: κακαί is a similar case. Thus Kock at *frag.* 218 of his edition of Menander (= *frag.* 187 Koerte) wrote "mutuatus est ut solebat versum Menander ab Euripide"; Koerte commented "versum Euripidi deberi, a Menandro in Thaidem trans-

²⁰ See, ex. gr., E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Princeton 1968), p. 97. C. A. Trypanis, in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*² s. v. *Callimachus* (p. 195), observes "... the great number of Callimachean papyri — even greater than those of Euripides ..." But Callimachus was surely not more widely read than Euripides, and even if he were, it would not affect at all our argument — which is that Euripides was the most widely read tragedian. Furthermore, it is not at all clear to me that Trypanis' statement is correct. See W. H. Willis in *GRBS* 9, 1968, 212; his figures are 75 papyri for Euripides and 50 for Callimachus.

latum esse paene certum est." (Compare also Koerte's comments at *frag.* 749.) In fact, Photius, in a passage, the significance of which does not seem to have been properly recognized, still preserves traces of a tradition deriving this verse from a "double" source: ἐτι δὲ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπιστολῇ Μενάνδρου τοῦ κωμικοῦ (γνώμας δὲ αὐτὸς ἀναγράφεται ἀρχαίων τινῶν) μέμνηται [sc. ὁ Παῦλος], λέγων οὕτως: φθείρουσιν ἤδη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί" (*PG* 101.813C). (For a clear example of double attribution, compare the remarks of the Byzantine commentator Michael of Ephesus, who quotes the well-known verse ἐν ■ δικαιοσύνη συλλήβδην πᾶς ἀρετὴ ἐστίν and observes ἡ δὲ παροιμία Θεόγνιδος ἐστίν [v. 147], ὡς Θεόφραστός φησιν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ Ἡθῶν ..., ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἡθικῶν ὡς Φωκυλίδου [*frag.* 10] αὐτοῦ μέμνηται· καὶ οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν καὶ Φωκυλίδην αὐτῷ καὶ Θεόγνιν χρήσασθαι [*Comm. ad Arist. Eth. Nic.* 5,2 p. 1129b, 27, p. 8 Hayduck]. In this case the solution is by no means so clear as with ■ double attribution to Euripides and Menander.)

We may, therefore, accept the statement that this verse appeared in Menander, provided we understand that Menander himself borrowed it from some tragedian, most probably Euripides. But we have seen that editors of the New Testament and of Menander go further: They assure us that the verse occurred specifically in the (lost) comedy *Thais*. What is the evidence for this assertion? It is this. The great sixteenth-century printer and scholar Henricus Stephanus (Henri Estienne) recorded that he found in the margin of a single New Testament manuscript ("ex vetustis exemplaribus") a comment at 1 *Corinthians* 15.33: Μενάνδρου τοῦ κωμικοῦ γνώμη ἐν Θαΐδῃ.²¹ Stephanus conjectured that Θαΐδῃ was a corruption of Θαΐδι. I will not say that Stephanus' conjecture Θαΐδι is not correct, for it may be so. Nor will I say that this piece of information in the margin of one lost manuscript is false, for the verse in question may in fact have appeared in Menander's *Thais*. However, I will say that if any extant writer who alludes to this verse was in possession of that information, he has not told us so.²² I will also say that whether φθείρουσιν ἤδη χρηστὰ ὁμιλίας κακαί

²¹ *Com. Gr.*, p. 351. I have not ■ this work and owe my knowledge of it to Koerte's edition of Menander, *frag.* 187. P. H. Ling in *The Classical Quarterly* 19. 1925. 22 adds: "A MS used by Robert Estienne in the sixteenth century, and vaguely referred to by his son, Henri Estienne, seems to have had ■ marginal note, Μενάνδρου τοῦ κωμικοῦ γνώμη ἐν Θαΐδῃ (sic)."

²² It may be objected that the scholar or copyist, who wrote ἐν Θαΐδῃ in the margin of a manuscript (assuming that such is the correct restoration of ἐν Θαΐδῃ) must have had access to some information now lost to us.

occurred in Euripides or Menander or both, it is quite possible that St. Paul did not know even this much, let alone the name of the particular play(s). For there is some evidence that by Paul's time the verse had become a proverbial commonplace, and he may have been quite unaware of the source. In our times the English-speaking peoples often dispense old wine from Shakespeare and the Bible without knowing either the vintner or the vintage. In the first century before Christ this verse was well enough known that Diodorus Siculus could silently borrow it for his history: [Φιλίππος] ταῖς πονηραῖς ὁμιλαῖς διέφθειρε τὰ ἤθη τῶν ἀνθρώπων (16.54); compare also Diodorus 12.12: ἔγραψε δὲ ὁ Χαρώνδας καὶ περὶ τῆς κακομιλίας νόμον... ὑπολαβὼν γὰρ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας ἐνίοτε διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πονηροὺς φιλίαν καὶ συνήθειαν διαστρέφεσθαι τὰ ἤθη πρὸς κακίαν — See further the verses, famous in antiquity, from Euripides *Phoenix* (frag. 812. 7-9 Nauck²):

ὅστις δ' ὁμιλῶν ἤδεται κακοῖς ἀνὴρ,
οὐ πάποτ' ἤρώτησα, γιγνώσκων ὅτι
τοιούτος ἐστὶν ὡς περ ἤδεται ξυνών.

(With these compare especially Euripides, frag. 609N².) Apparently Menander did not refrain from borrowing these verses also — or rather the first words (presumably enough for his audience to

Otherwise this marginal comment would be without motivation and inexplicable. A little reflection exposes the speciousness of this reasoning. We do not know the context in which φθείρουσιν ἤθη χάριθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί occurred; one legitimate and natural interpretation of the words is "Consorting with immoral women corrupts good morals." (Recall that ὁμιλία, besides its other meanings, was normal Greek for sexual intercourse.) Suppose that our learned (*Christian*!) copyist so understood the words. The *Thais* was one of Menander's most famous comedies and this piece of information continued to be accessible long after the play itself was lost. (For its fame, both in the Greek and Latin traditions, see Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* III, pp. 60-61). There was furthermore an historical personage named *Thais*; she was perhaps the most famous of all Greek courtesans — a fact which was common knowledge quite independently of Menander's play. A glance at all the known titles of Menander's comedies — including those titles not likely to be familiar in medieval times (in contrast, that is, to the *Thais*) — will not reveal a single title more appropriate *prima facie* than *Thais* — the name of a play in which such a sentiment might be expected to occur. The sequence is this: 1) Menander warned against corrupting oneself by associating with immoral women; 2) Menander wrote a *Thais*; 3) the historical *Thais* was the "painted woman" *par excellence*. The conclusion to be drawn was there for the taking. Such an inference is of course quite unjustified, but anyone who thinks that someone in late antiquity or the Middle Ages was not fully capable of making it does not know how these "scholiasts" practiced their craft.

recognize the source: a clear indication of how familiar the passage was²²). See J. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca Oxoniensia* IV. 144. 31: "ὅστις δ' ὁμιλῶν ἤδεται." τοῦτο τοῦ Θεόγνιδος and *ib.* 145. 1 τοῦ Τζέτζου. Μενάνδρου τοῦτο πέφυκεν ἐκ δράματος Ἰλλακίου [= frag. 344 Koerte], οὐ Θεόγνιδος. I should like to suggest that the false attribution to Theognis may go back to a confusion in a *florilegium* which contained these verses and also one or more passages from the Theognidean corpus which show similar sentiments; see Theognis 31-38, 113-114, 1169. However that may be, the Theognis references are clear evidence that this piece of proverbial wisdom is older than Menander — and than Euripides as well. For further proof see Hesiod, *Erga* 716 and Aeschylus, *Septem contra Thebas* 599-600. (On Democritus, frag. 184 D-K φρύλων ὁμιλῆ συνεχῆς ἔξιν κακίης συναύξει see W. K. C. Guthrie, *A History of Greek Philosophy* II. 491.)

When, therefore, an editor of the New Testament restricts himself at 1 Corinthians 15. 33 to the too specific annotation "Menander *Thais* frag. 187", his annotation is possibly a positive error; it is certainly misleading. *It would continue to be misleading, even were we to acquire new evidence proving conclusively that the line occurred in Menander's Thais.*

I consider next Titus 1. 12:

εἰπέν τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης,
«Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί.»

The little that is certain about this verse can be briefly stated: The words Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ἀργαί are a dactylic hexameter; they seem to have been modelled on Hesiod *Theogony* 26 (compare also *Iliad* 24. 260-261). This hexameter must have been well-known in antiquity, since the words Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται are incorporated by Callimachus in his *Hymn to Zeus*, verse 8, and are alluded to also in a poem in the *Anthologia Palatina* (7. 275. 5-8).²³ Apparently the words were attributed to Epimenides the Cretan in antiquity; at least Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 1. 59 = II. 37. 21 Stählin)

²² It is commonplace for familiar quotations to become proverbial in an abridged form. Compare the English "A word to the wise ..." = *verbum sapienti sat*. In Greek a good example is *Odyssey* 21. 295-6:

οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον, ἔγκλεισθ' Ἑλευσίονα,
ἔας' ἐν μεγάρῳ μεγαθύμου Περικλοῖο

The opening words οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον became proverbial; they re-appear in two extant epigrams in the *Anthologia Palatina*, II.1 (Nicarchus) and II.12 (Alcaeus). See further Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* II. p. 10.

²³ See my *Greek Textual Criticism*, p. 53.

so ascribes them. For further references the reader should consult H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*² I. 31-32, where this verse is printed as fragment 1 of Epimenides. Epimenides himself is a very shadowy, half-legendary figure; he appears in the Greek tradition as a religious prophet and wonder-worker who lived to a miraculous age (sometime between the seventh and fifth centuries before Christ) and was able to wander about outside his body.²¹ Jerome and Socrates state that this verse comes from the *Oracles* (Χρησμοί) of Epimenides; this is often repeated in editions of the New Testament and may be correct — provided we keep in mind that none of the fragments of "Epimenides" which have survived can be securely assigned to a definite historical personage of that name. We are dealing with a semi-apocryphal figure. (Thus to distinguish, as is done in some editions of the New Testament, between "Epimenides", the author of the hexameter preserved in *Titus* 1. 12, and "Pseudo-Epimenides", the author of the supposed verse ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἔσμεν in *Acts* 17. 28 is an idle business.)

In the midst of such uncertainty it is best to let the specialists speak for themselves. Otto Kern (see note 24) gives the following judgment: "Dem historischen E. gehört nur die Theogonie... Mit Recht vermutet Diels, dass der berühmte u. a. bei Paulus ad Tit. 1. 12 citierte Vers: Κρητὲς ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κατὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαὶ aus dem Prooimion der Theogonie des E. stammt. Paulus führt ihn auf einen ἴδιος προφῆτης der Kreter zurück. Es verschlägt nichts, wenn Hieron. comm. in ep. ad Tit. VII 606 Migno den Vers aus den *Oracula* des E. *Cretensis* (= χρησμοί) anführt..." With this compare Kranz in the ninth edition of *Vorsokr.* (see above): "Die erhaltenen Fragmente des Epimenides scheinen sich auf zwei oder drei Verfasser zu verteilen: 1) Θεογονία aus dem Kreise des Onomakritos, Ende des 6. Jahrh. verfasst, nach dem Inhalte auch Χρησμοί genannt; 2) Κρητικὰ, nach E. Neustadt *de Iore Cretico* (Berl. 1906) Prosawerk, zwischen Megasthenes und Arat verfasst (doch vgl. Pohlenz *N. Jahrb.* 32, 1916, I 570²), kretische Lokalgeschichte, zweifelhaft 3) Καθαρμοί in Prosa... oder in Hexametern?" In other words: there is no agreement among specialists a) whether the verse goes back to the historical

²¹ For further particulars and references see O. Kern in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie d. klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, s. v. *Epimenides* 2. There are some useful remarks about Epimenides by E. Rohde in his great work *Psyche* pp. 300-304 (English tr. 1925) with ff. nn. 114-124 (especially f. n. 120 arguing that behind all the fabulous material there was in fact an historical figure Epimenides).

Epimenides or to an anonymous forger and b) whether the poem in which it occurred, whoever the author, was called *Θεογονία* or *Χρησμός* or both. On the other hand, it seems clear that the author of the *epistle to Titus* believed that he was quoting Epimenides; the reference to an ἱδρυὶς προφῆτης of the Cretans shows that.

What kind of reference should be given at *Titus* 1.12? A classical scholar would note in the *apparatus criticus* simply "Epimenides, frag. 1 Diels-Kranz" and this is best. A typical annotation in current editions of the New Testament is the following: "Epimenides, *de Oraculis*". After the account which I have given above, this will doubtless appear to some as too specific and therefore misleading (as well as impractical — a diligent scriptural student would look long and in vain for a copy of Epimenides' *De Oraculis*!). This is a minor criticism; consider however the following comment from the Westminster Version of the New Testament at *Titus* 1. 12: "The extract is from the *Minos* of the early Cretan poet Epimenides. The context, as now established (cf. Dr. Rendel Harris' Introduction to the *Commentaries of Isho'dad* Vol. V Part II, p. xiv) is this: 'the Cretans ■■■ liars' because they say that Zeus (the Greek Jupiter) was killed, and show his tomb: 'but thou over livest', cries the poet to Zeus, for in thee we live and move and have our being'. This last line is quoted in Acts xvii. 28, where it is followed by yet another quotation, this time from the Cilician Stoic Aratus. Those lines from the *Minos* form a valuable link between the Apostle's discourses and writings..." Diels-Kranz state simply and correctly "Die kühnen Schlüsse von J. Rendel Harris ... sind abzulehnen." There are no grounds whatsoever for attributing the hexameter in *Titus* 1. 12 to the "Minos" of Epimenides. The Syriac commentary on Acts of 'Isho'dad (ninth century A. D.), on which Dr. Rendel Harris based his reconstruction, makes no mention either of Epimenides or of a poem entitled *Minos*; here is what 'Isho'dad does say (in Rendel Harris' translation): "...so, therefore, Minos, son of Zeus, made a panegyric ■■■ behalf of his father, (sic!) and he said in it, The Cretans made a tomb for thee, O Holy and Lofty! liars! evil beasts and slow bellies; for thou art not dead for ever; thou art alive and risen; for in thee we live, and are moved and have our being; so therefore the blessed Paul took this sentence from Minos; for he took again, *We are the offspring of God*, from Aratus a poet..." This passage does seem to connect Acts 17.28 and *Titus* 1.12 as containing verses from the same passage of

some poem; unfortunately, a little analysis reveals that we are dealing with a garbled piece of learning valueless as evidence. For it is clear, even in translation, that this "panegyric of Minos, son of Zeus" in fact derives partly from Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, verses 8-9:

Ῥηῆτες αἰὶ ψεύσται· καὶ γὰρ τάφον, ὦ ἄνα, σεῖο
Ῥηῆτες ἐτεκτίναντο· σὺ δ' οὐ θάνεις, ἔσσι γὰρ αἰεὶ.

This is not mere conjecture; evidence is still extant which proves that exegetical tradition had brought Callimachus into this context. For example, Theodoretus of Cyrus' commentary on *Titus* 1.12 (PG 82. 861 B) is as follows: "ἐπεὶ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἰδίας αὐτῶν προφητῆς· Ῥηῆτες αἰὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί, ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής." οὐ γὰρ Ἰουδαίων προφήτης Καλλίμαχος ἦν (αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ ἔπους ἀρχή), ἀλλ' Ἑλλήνων ἦν ποιητής, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ποιητὴς διὰ τὸν τοῦ Διὸς τάφον τοὺς Ῥηῆτας ὠνόμασε ψεύστας. For other references see Pfeiffer's edition of Callimachus. (There are further indications of confused classical learning in this same chapter of *Isho'dad*: "The Interpreter [i.e. Theodore of Mopsuestia] says, that the Athenians were once upon a time at war with their enemies, and the enemies retreated from them in defeat; then a certain Daemon appeared and said unto them I have never been honoured by you as I ought; and because I am angry with you, therefore you have a defeat from your enemies. Then the Athenians were afraid, and raised to him the well-known altar..." It seems to have gone unnoticed that this story ultimately goes back to the account of Pan's appearance to Philippides in Herodotus 6.105).

This discussion has taken us to *Acts* 17.28 and that passage must now be examined:

ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν,
ὥς καὶ τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασιν,
τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν.

This verse has been the object of an inordinate amount of bad annotation. There is no need to rehearse it all here; I cite as an extreme example the note in the Anchor Bible: "The words 'For by him we live, move and exist' are a modification of the fourth line of a quatrain ascribed to Epimenides by Diogenes Laertius (*Lives of Philosophers* i. 112). The quatrain's second line is quoted by Paul in *Tit* i 12." Suffice to say that one will look in vain in Diogenes Laertius 1.112 for any trace of a single line,

modified or no, of any quatrain ascribed to anybody. (Whether this thoroughly garbled note ultimately goes back to the already garbled statement of Dr. Rendel Harris, *loc. cit.* I shall not attempt to decide: "... I ventured the suggestion that the whole of the quoted matter came from the *Minos* of Epimenides, seeing that Diogenes Laertius wrote a poem of a thousand verses under this title ..." What was intended, of course, was "... Diogenes Laertius [records that Epimenides] wrote a poem of a thousand verses" *vel. sim.*, and the omission may be merely a typographical error. Nevertheless, even the figure "a thousand verses" is false; here are Diogenes' words: συνέγραψε δὲ [*sc.* 'Ἐπιμηνίδης] καὶ καταλογάδην περὶ Θυσίων καὶ τῆς ἐν Κρήτῃ πολιτείας καὶ περὶ Μίνω καὶ 'Ραδαμάνθους εἰς ἔπη τετρακισχίδια. Note that it is not clear from Diogenes' Greek — περὶ Μίνω καὶ 'Ραδαμάνθους — whether one poem ("Minos and Rhadamanthys") or two are intended. *Apart from this ambiguous statement in Diogenes Laertius, there is no extant reference to a poem by Epimenides entitled 'Minos'.*)

Behind all the confusion surrounding this verse there is a very real problem and it is this: How many quotations is the author of *Acts* here citing? In particular, a) is ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν a poetic quotation and b) is τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν from Aratus or Cleanthes or both? The plural expression ὡς καὶ τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν εἰρήχασιν clearly has a bearing on the problem and must be taken into account. The answer to the first question is negative: To the best of our knowledge, ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν, while undeniably a splendid and sublime phrase, is not poetry; presumably it is the author of *Acts*' own creation. (This is not to deny that he may have had a model, perhaps a very close one, for it. If so, it has not survived.) To begin with, there is no discernible meter. (This is significant for the origin of the tradition preserved in 'Isho'dad, which connects Κρήτες-ἄγροι and ἐν αὐτῷ-ἐσμέν as parts of the same poem. Whoever first proposed this interpretation no longer understood Greek metrics, not even the dactylic hexameter. This points to the time when the pronunciation of Greek had changed so much that vowel quantities were no longer clearly distinguishable. This change — complete by about A. D. 400. See Paul Maas, *Greek Metre*, paragraph 19. This metrical ignorance also points to a circle which had a minimum of first-hand classical learning (in contrast to handbook knowledge). In other words, this tradition, by its very content, condemns itself as late and worthless.

It is obvious how the words in *Acts* 17.28 could appear to someone ignorant of metrics as a hexameter:

ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν | καὶ κινούμεθα | καὶ ἐσμέν

There is no need to list the metrical solecisms in this "verse"; they would have been obvious to any Greek who had been to school even well after the "classical" period. It is not without significance that that good Hellenist, Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.10 — II 59.1 ff. Stählin), shows no knowledge of this theory.) Secondly, the language could not have occurred in a poem (or elsewhere) prior to some considerable philosophical development. For the language is that of Greek philosophy; both ἐν αὐτῷ, used of the Deity in connection with these verbs, and κινούμεθα, in this context, smack of philosophical usage. (Expressions such as Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrannus* v. 314 ἐν σοὶ γὰρ ἐσμέν and Euripides, *Alceste* v. 278 ἐν σοὶ δ' ἐσμέν καὶ ζῆν καὶ μῆ are not at all parallel, first appearances to the contrary. In these cases ἐν σοὶ ἐσμέν means simply "we are in your power", *penes te sumus*; this idiom is quite distinct from the "pantheistic" usage ἐν αὐτῷ ... ἐσμέν of *Acts*. Compare rather Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 4.38 θεῶν γὰρ χωρὶς οὐδ' ἐν ἄλλῳ ἐσμέν.) Linguistic factors, therefore, exclude an early epic poem, such as "Epimenides' *Minos*", from consideration. (I am aware that this is a subjective judgment; usage will, I believe, bear me out.) The thought contained in this sentence is often described as Stoic. I long ago had noted as the closest linguistic parallel for this expression in *Acts* the following locution from Arius Didymus' *Epitome* 26 (= H. Diels *Doxographi Graeci* p. 461, 23-25): ὁ δὲ Χρυσίππος χρόνον εἶναι κινήσεως διάστημα ... καὶ κατὰ μὲν τὸν χρόνον κινεῖσθαι τε ἕκαστα καὶ εἶναι. It was therefore with no little pleasure that I found in Eduard Norden's celebrated study *Agnostos Theos* this same passage compared with *Acts* 17.28. His words deserve to be quoted: "Die Begriffe 'Bewegung' and 'Sein' sind verbunden bei Chrysippos [there follow the Greek words given above], eine Verbindung, die H. Diels charakteristisch ersehien, dass er sie im Index der *Doxographi* eigens verzeichnete. Wenn wir endlich noch die bekannten stoischen Etymologien erwägen: Ζεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ πᾶσι δεδοκέναι τὸ ζῆν (Chrysippos bei Stob. ecl. I 31, 12W.), καλοῦμεν αὐτὸν καὶ Ζῆνα καὶ Δία ..., ὡς ἂν εἰ λέγοιμεν δὲ ὃν ζῶμεν (Ps. Aristot. de mundo c. 7 401 a 13), wo also die Übereinstimmung mit der Stelle der *Acta* sich bis auf die Verbalform selbst erstreckt, so werden wir in ζῶμεν, κινούμεθα, ἐσμέν stoische Begriffe zu erkennen haben, die aber vielleicht erst der Verf. der *Acta* zu

einer formelhaften, feierlich klingenden Trias verbunden hat." ²⁵ There is, in sum, no evidence for regarding ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν as a poetical quotation.

By contrast, τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν is certainly a citation from poetry. It is the opening of verse five of the Φαινόμενα, a still extant astronomical poem written by Aratus of Soli (in Cilicia) in the third century before Christ.²⁶ The only difference is that the author of *Acts* has "trivialized" the dialect form (epic and Ionic) ἐσμέν which Aratus wrote, to the more usual ἐσμέν. Commentators have long noted the strong similarity to verse four of Cleanthes' famous *Hymn to Zeus*²⁷:

4. ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν, ἡχου' μίμημα λαχόντες
μοῦνοι, ὅσα ζῶει τε καὶ ἔπειθ' ὄνῃτ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν.

(The latter part of verse four is unfortunately corrupt and no solution to date has found general acceptance. For a useful survey of conjectures hitherto proposed, see M. Marcovich in *Hermes* 94, 1966, 245-250 (and compare K. Gaiser in *Hermes* 90, 1968, 243-247). I have discussed these verses and the theology behind them in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68, 1964, 382-386, to which the reader is referred.) The reason for the similarity is easily explained: Aratus and Cleanthes were contemporaries, both of whom studied Stoicism in Athens; Cleanthes certainly, Aratus possibly, studied directly under Zeno, the founder of Stoicism. The similarities are due to a common source or to a direct borrowing, one from the other. However, similarity is not identity, and it is simply incorrect to state, as commentators often do, that the author of *Acts* is quoting Cleanthes here. The plain fact is that the words τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν belong to Aratus and to no one else.

This brings us to the plural τινες in *Acts* 17.28; this is the real culprit which has caused many (consciously or unconsciously) to seek more than one quotation here, and which must now be explained. It will be well to distinguish clearly two separate

²⁵ Eduard Norden *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig-Berlin 1923), p. 22. See in this important work especially pp. 19-24.

²⁶ For what we know of Aratus see Wilamowitz's *Hellenistische Dichtung* II, 274-276.

²⁷ The hymn is printed in I. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* vol. I, pp. 121-123 and J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*, pp. 227-228. It has been preserved for us by Stobaeus, *Ed.* I, 1.12.

confusions for which *τινες* has been responsible: a) the desire to take *both* ἐν αὐτῷ — ἐσμέν and τοῦ γὰρ — ἐσμέν as poetic quotations and b) the tendency to regard τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν as some sort of conflation of Aratus and Cleanthes. Thus the Westminster Version of the New Testament annotates at Acts 17.28: "... 'some' in the plural, because Cleanthes and probably others had expressed the same idea as Aratus." I myself was guilty of a similar error (which I now retract) when I wrote in the paper on Cleanthes referred to above "The commentators have correctly understood that *τινες* is used because the sacred writer is thinking not only of Aratus' verse, but also of Cleanthes'." The facts are as follows. In English one may introduce loosely a familiar single and specific poetic quotation by some such general phrase as "As the poets say ..." Greek had the same idiom and ὡς καὶ *τινες* τῶν καθ' ὅμῃς ποιητῶν εἰρήκασιν in Acts 17.28 is an example of this idiom. Here are some other examples:

- 1) *Lycurgus contra Leocratem* c. 92 καὶ μοι δοκοῦσι τῶν ἀρχαίων *τινὲς* ποιητῶν ὥσπερ χρησιμὸς γράψαντες τοῖς ἐπιγεγραμμένοις τάδε τὰ λαμβεῖα καταλιπεῖν. There follow four iambic trimeters from a lost Greek tragedy (= *frag. adespota* 296 Nauck).
- 2) *Lycurgus contra Leocratem* c. 132 ὅθεν καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν *τινες* εἰρήκασιν. There follow two iambic trimeters from a lost Greek tragedy (= *frag. adespota* 297 Nauck).
- 3) Aristotle *Politica* 7. 16 (p. 1335b 32-34) αὕτη δ' ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἥνπερ τῶν ποιητῶν *τινες* εἰρήκασιν οἱ μετροῦντες ταῖς ἐβδομάσι τὴν ἡλικίαν, περὶ τὸν χρόνον τὸν τῶν πεντήκοντα ἐτῶν. It is generally believed that Aristotle here has in mind specifically Solon, *frag.* 19 Diehl, the familiar elegy on the "ages of man". (See especially verse 13.)
- 4) [Aristotle] *Magna Moralia* 2. 15 init. (p. 1212b, 27ff.) λέγουσι γὰρ τοιαῦτα καὶ οἱ ποιηταί· "ὅταν δ' ὁ δαίμων εὖ διδῷ, τί δεῖ φίλων;" The quotation is verse 667 of Euripides' *Orestes*.
- 5) Simplicius in *Aristot. Phys. ausc.* fol. 73b καὶ τῶν ποιητῶν δὲ *ἐνιοι* πάντα σχεδὸν εἰς τὴν τύχην ἀναγοῦσιν, ὥστε καὶ τῆς τέχνης οὐκείαν αὐτὴν ποιεῖν λέγοντες "τέχνη τύχην ἑστερξε καὶ τύχη τέχνην" (= Agathon *frag.* 6 Nauck). "τὸν εὐτυχ-οῦντα" δὲ "καὶ φρονεῖν" φασί. (= Euripides *frag.* 1017 Nauck). Note that this passage contains two examples of the idiom.

These examples prove conclusively that *τινες* τῶν ποιητῶν and similar expressions can introduce a single quotation.²⁸ It should be noted

²⁸ While a student at Harvard I once asked, in private conversation,

that the examples range from the classical period (the Attic orator Lysurgus, Aristotle) to the sixth century A. D. (the Aristotelian commentator Simplicius); that is to say, we are dealing with a *modus loquendi* which remained normal Greek for centuries. It is found long before *Acts* and remained in use long after it. That the author of *Acts* was familiar with Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus* is perfectly possible; I am prepared to say that it may even be probable. The fact remains that there is not a shred of evidence in the language of *Acts* 17.28 which suggests positively that the author of that verse had Cleanthes in mind when he wrote it. That will remain forever undemonstrable.

This study has thus far permitted us to verify three classical quotations in 1 *Corinthians* 15.33, *Titus* 1.12 and *Acts* 17.28 respectively; at the same time we have been able to dismiss two imaginary quotations ("Epimenides", Cleanthes) from *Acts* 17.28. All these passages, if not always properly understood, have long been recognized. One final question must now occupy us: Are there likely to be any other exact quotations from classical literature in the New Testament not hitherto recognized? Numerous attempts have been made to discover such quotations; in general I would agree with the following assessment: "The search for verses and fragments of verses (apart from quotations: A 17: 28, 1C 15: 33, T 1: 12), i. e. for rhythm, is a needless waste of time and those that are found are of such quality that they are better left unmentioned..."²² To take one example, *Philippians* 3.1: τὰ αὐτὰ γράφειν ὑμῖν ἐποὶ μὲν οὐκ ὀκνηρόν, ὑμῖν δὲ ἀσφαλές. It has been thought by some that the words ἐποὶ μὲν — ἀσφαλές, which form an iambic trimeter, (understanding, of course, δ' ἀσφαλές) are from some comic writer, possibly Menander. See J. Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, pp. 89, 167 and H. J. Rose in *The Classical Quarterly* 19. 1925. 92-93. (For the language one might have compared a trimeter in Sophocles (*Oedipus Rex* v. 834) which begins with ἡμῖν μέν, ὄναξ, ταῦτ' ὀκνήψ'.) It is not possible to refute absolutely suggestions such as this one (where the words in ques-

the late Arthur Darby Nock, that θηροποιός of learning, about τρεῖς in *Acts* 17.28. He assured me that the plural could introduce a single quotation and added that he had some examples of this noted down somewhere in his Harvard rooms. I own that at the time I was skeptical and never learned what his examples were. The examples which I adduce in the present paper demonstrate that in this, as in so much else, Nock was right.

²² Blass-Debrunner *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* 2-16, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago 1961), § 487 (q. v. for the modern literature).

tion are undeniably = trimeter); one can only point out the weaknesses inherent in such attempts. In the first place, the contrast between οὐκ ἐκνηρόν and ἀσφαλές is hardly the most natural one; to me at least it smacks more of Saint Paul's style than of the New Comedy of Menander. In the second place, the word-order is quite natural (i. e. "non-poetic"): pronoun + μέν + predicate adjective followed by corresponding pronoun + δέ + corresponding predicate adjective. Cannot the iambic meter be due to chance? The answer is that it can, very easily indeed. The late Professor Rose himself, writing in a different context, stated the situation quite lucidly, and I hope that I shall not seem unkind if I quote him against himself: "Greek, as Aristotle observes and as extant Greek prose amply proves, had a tendency to fall into quite another kind of metre, the iambic... The first speech of Lysias, which is in a designedly plain and familiar style for the most part (the speaker is represented as a simple honest man, grievously wronged), shows in 30 lines of the Oxford text (sections 15-18) 19 fragments of iambic trimeters of comic type, and we may be sure that actual speech would contain a higher proportion, for Arist. says, *Il. cc.*, that whole trimeters were often undesignedly uttered. Similarly in English, a careless prose style often runs into rough blank verse, a conspicuous fault in Dickens, for instance."³⁰ The occasional appearance of accidental iambic lengths in the New Testament calls for no explanation; in fact, it is rather the absence of such "metrical" lengths that would have been puzzling.

A comparison of two extant passages, one Greek and one Latin, sheds some light on the whole question of the possible presence in the New Testament of unrecognized classical quotations; so far as I can discover, this comparison, and the inference to be drawn from it, has not been made. The first passage is from the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Socrates (3.16 = PG 67, 421 C - 424 A); the context is significant: Socrates argues in defence of Christians' learning τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν παιδείαν. The pertinent section runs as follows:

"Should any one imagine that in making these assertions we wrest the Scriptures from their legitimate construction, let it be remembered that the Apostle not only does not forbid our being instructed in Greek learning, but that he himself seems by no

³⁰ H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Literature*, p. 81 (with n. 2). The references to Aristotle are *Poetics* 1449^a 24, *Rhetoric* 1408^b 33, 1404^a 31.

means to have neglected it, inasmuch as he knows many of the sayings of the Greeks. Whence did he get the saying, 'The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow-bellies,' but from a perusal of *The Oracles* of Epimenides, the Cretan Initiator? Or how would he have known this, 'For we are also his offspring,' had he not been acquainted with *The Phenomena* of Aratus the astronomer? Again this sentence, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners,' is a sufficient proof that he was conversant with the tragedies of Euripides. But what need is there of enlarging on this point? It is well known that in ancient times the doctors of the church by unhindered usage were accustomed to exercise themselves in the learning of the Greeks, until they had reached an advanced age: this they did with a view to improve themselves in eloquence and to strengthen and polish their mind, and at the same time to enable them to refute the errors of the heathen." (tr. A. C. Zenos)

The second passage is from the 70th *epistula* of Saint Jerome (section 2); in this letter (addressed to Flavius Magnus, *orator urbis Romae*) Jerome, like Socrates, defends the "pagan" classics:

quod autem quaeris in calce epistolae cur in opusculis nostris saecularium litterarum interdum ponamus exempla, et candorem ecclesiae ethnicorum sordibus polluamus, breviter responsum habeto: ... et Paulus apostolus Epimenidis poetae abusus versiculo est, scribens ad Titum: "Cretenses semper mendaces, malae bestiae, ventres pigri." cuius heroici hemistichium postea Callimachus usurpavit. nec mirum si apud Latinos metrum non servet ad verbum expressa translatio, cum Homerus eadem lingua versus in prosam vix cohaereat. in alia quoque epistula Menandri ponit senarium: "corrumpunt mores bonos confabulationes pessimae." et apud Athenienses in Martii curia disputans Aratum testem vocat: "ipsius enim et genus sumus", quod Graece dicitur: τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν, et est clausula versus heroici.

The long debate in the early Church over the value (or lack of it) of pagan literature is well-known. These two passages (and others) show that Christian defenders of the "classics" had formulated — a stock argument the fact that even sacred scripture quoted Greek literature. (Jerome describes Aratus' words as a "*clausula versus heroici*"; by this he means that they are the end of a hexameter line. In fact, they are the beginning of a hexameter. This is a clear indication — if one were needed — that his argument is derivative; he could not have made this mistake, had he himself consulted Aratus' poem and not rather

borrowed his reference from a secondary authority.) It can be no accident that both Socrates and Jerome adduce the same three quotations for the same purpose³¹; they clearly are both using the same traditional argument. Clement of Alexandria, whom Jaeger has described as "the first author who paid special attention to such literary quotations in the books of the New Testament",³² knew only these same three quotations. Apparently no one between Clement on the one hand and Jerome and Socrates on the other was able to discover any additional quotations. (In the ninth century the learned Photius, in an enquiry entitled *Περὶ τῶν χρησίων τῶν ἔξω ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ Γραφῇ εὐρισκομένων* (PG 101.813A-D) still knows only the same three.) We have seen the contexts in which these three quotations appear together; they are adduced for a polemic purpose, to justify the study of classical literature on the part of Christians. Three quotations from all of the New Testament — all from "Paul" — are not many. The probable inference is plain: If these Christian apologists for the classics had known of other quotations in the New Testament which would have bolstered their argument, they surely would have cited them. We must conclude that they knew of no others. Yet these Christians of the early Church were familiar with a much larger corpus of Greek literature than we; *certainly they knew all the Greek literature known to the authors of the New Testament*. And there were real scholars among them; one need only mention Clement, Origen, Basil and the two Gregories, Augustine, and Jerome.

An *argumentum ex silentio* is never fully satisfying; it can give us only probability. But if, in this case, we must resign ourselves to probabilities, at least the probabilities are strong, and they can be clearly stated: 1) there are three certain classical quotations in the New Testament; 2) it is extremely unlikely that any additional classical quotations have been or will be found in the New Testament.

Boston College

³¹ The apparent discrepancy between the references to Euripides and Menander has been discussed above.

³² *Op. cit.* (see note 17), p. 112, n. 28.

POSTSCRIPT

Since the writing of this paper Professor Margaret Schatkin of Boston College has very kindly called my attention to the discussion by Kirsopp Lake of *Acts* 17.28, "Your Own Poets" (= Additional Note XX in *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part I. Vol. V. pp. 246-251). Professor Lake is inclined to accept the reconstruction of Rendel Harris and writes, for instance, "This evidence seems sufficient to justify the statement that 'we live and move and have our being' is a reference to Epimenides" (p. 250). There is no need of going over his opinions point by point; I am venturesome enough to state that his position is adequately refuted in the preceding pages and no longer merits serious consideration. Nor can I recommend to the reader another article to which Professor Schatkin has courteously called my attention: Alphons Marth, S. J., "Die Zitate des hl. Paulus aus der Profanliteratur" in *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 37. 1913. 880-895. Father Marth gives a useful list of references (all the essential ones and more are included in the present paper), but he has not evaluated them as critically as one might wish. Furthermore, in his eagerness to argue for a first-hand familiarity with *Profanliteratur* on the part of Paul (and he attributes without question to the historical Paul not only *I Cor.* 15.33 but also *Acts* 17.28 and *Titus* 1.12), he fails to distinguish adequately between *hypothesis* and *probability*. (It of course goes without saying that in the present paper, because of the enormous modern literature on the subject, I have had to be rigidly selective in my bibliographical references. I quote what seemed to me most pertinent and/or useful — a procedure by its very nature to a certain extent arbitrary.) I should also like to thank Professor Bruce M. Metzger of the Princeton Theological Seminary, who graciously read this paper and made several helpful suggestions.